

City of Springfield  
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF  
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2006

The City of Springfield Council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, February 27, 2006 at 5:30 p.m., with Councilor Ballew and Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Leiken (5:40 p.m.), Councilors Fitch (5:40 p.m.), Ballew, Lundberg, Ralston, and Pishioneri. Also present were Interim City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

Councilor Woodrow was absent (excused).

1. Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA) Name Change Proposal.

Interim City Manager Cynthia Pappas presented the staff report on this item. She introduced Merlyn Hough, Director of LRAPA.

On December 8, 2005, a letter was received from Merlyn Hough who was, at that time, Interim Director of LRAPA, regarding the proposed name change of LRAPA from Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority to the *Lane Regional Air Protection Agency*. In order to complete the process of the name change, each of the five member entities (Lane County, City of Cottage Grove, City of Eugene, City of Oakridge and City of Springfield) must approve the change.

Springfield is the last entity to consider this change. The other four member entities approved the name change.

Mr. Hough will present this proposal at tonight's work session. Council is asked to consider approval of this name change.

Mr. Hough said this topic came up during the LRAPA Board discussion regarding the Mission Statement for LRAPA and establishing the four main goals of the authority. He noted the original purpose of LRAPA and that the scope of work had changed over the years. There were now more incentives for businesses and homes to improve air quality. The Board felt the old name had a negative connotation and wanted the name to better reflect their purpose. The Board approved the name change last fall, but the five intergovernmental partners that made up LRAPA had to also approve the name change. He discussed the other meetings they had held with the other four jurisdictions regarding this proposal. Those jurisdictions had all approved the name change.

Councilor Pishioneri asked if the term 'agency' had a specific meaning.

Mr. Leahy said it did not.

Councilor Ballew asked about LRAPA's role.

Mr. Hough said LRAPA was formed under state statute which allowed formation of regional air pollution authorities. Originally, there were three such authorities in 1968 when LRAPA was formed. The other two were Willamette Air Pollution Authority in Portland and Mid-Willamette Pollution Authority in Salem. Those two authorities had dissolved within about a decade. LRAPA had been around for about thirty-eight years and was the only remaining authority in Oregon. He noted that most of Washington and California was covered by local authorities. He discussed some of the authorities in California.

Councilor Pishioneri asked if this agency replicated another agency.

Mr. Hough said they did similar work as the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). If LRAPA were not here, DEQ would be required to take over this area. He said LRAPA did a better job and offered a higher service level to the citizens and businesses in Lane County because of their close work with other jurisdictions and the funding they received from different grants. Many of the grants were used to assist local businesses in reducing their air pollution. He discussed the different permit fees LRAPA received.

Councilor Ballew asked if LRAPA issued fines.

Mr. Hough said they did issue fines and cited people for violating air pollution rules. The civil penalties paid went into the Lane County General Fund, not to LRAPA directly. He said they would be asking Lane County to set aside that revenue for special air quality projects.

Councilor Ballew asked how much they received per year from fines.

Mr. Hough said it averaged about \$42,866 a year over the last 10 years. He said that amount fluctuated from year to year and was just an average.

Councilor Ralston said the money received from fines stayed locally. He said businesses appreciated the fact that LRAPA was there to serve them on a one to one basis and customize incentive plans for them. He gave examples. He said it had been his idea to change the name and keep the same acronym. He explained the process.

Councilor Lundberg asked about LRAPA's budget and how much they received from local jurisdictions.

Mr. Hough introduced Sharon Banks, Manager of Administration and Planning and Sally Marcos, half of the Job Shared Public Affair Program.

Ms. Banks said LRAPA's total annual budget was about \$2.5M. She said they had two Enterprise Funds that brought in dollars for the agency and the Special Projects Fund that was for one-time projects. She said they currently had a \$500,000 grant to upgrade school busses in Springfield, Eugene and other surrounding school districts. She said about \$270,000 came from dues from Eugene, Springfield and Lane County.

Mr. Hough said about fifteen percent of their General Fund was from the dues of the jurisdictions.

Ms. Banks said the dues were for the General Fund only and did not include the Special Projects Funds, which generated their own funding. She discussed two projects currently funded by those special funds.

Councilor Lundberg asked how much Springfield contributed.

Mr. Hough said it was about \$50,000, \$52,000 with the three percent increase they were requesting this year.

Discussion was held regarding the old and new name on publications.

Mr. Hough said until all five jurisdictions approved the name change, both names were being used.

Council consensus was to approve the name change.

Mr. Hough gave Ms. Pappas the originals for her signature that had already been signed by the other four jurisdictions.

Councilor Ralston suggested asking Ms. Banks to give Council a presentation on the value of LRAPA.

Ms. Banks said she would be happy to do so.

Ms. Pappas said they would discuss that with Council leadership.

Councilor Fitch suggested she speak during the Budget Committee meeting when other jurisdictions that received funding from Springfield spoke.

Ms. Pappas said a special Work Session was also scheduled to discuss all intergovernmental agreements (IGA's) and that could be another option for this presentation.

2. Review of Springfield Building Code Fees, and Master Schedule of Miscellaneous Fees and Charges, Rates, Permits, and Licenses.

Budget Officer Bob Brew presented the staff report on this item. The proposed increases being presented pertain to a variety of fees throughout the City. A departmental review of fees was conducted in the latter part of 2005 to ensure that amounts charged in 2006 for services at the City would continue to meet the Council adopted guidelines for cost recovery, where appropriate.

This departmental review has been completed. To address the City's increased cost of providing services, changes are recommended for certain fees contained in the Master schedule of miscellaneous fees, charges, rates, permits and licenses, and the Building Safety Code.

A public hearing is scheduled for March 6, 2006 for Council action on the above mentioned fees. The proposed First Responder Fee will be the subject of a separate public hearing on March 6, 2006.

At the request of Council, action on a proposed Business License Fee has been deferred until March 20th, pending analysis by a Council Subcommittee, and action on a proposed First Responder Fee has been deferred indefinitely.

Mr. Brew noted the new handout with the correct information which had been placed at Council places. He referred to the sentence on the agenda item summary (AIS) which stated that the First Responder Fee would be deferred indefinitely. Council had given direction to staff that during the public hearing on March 6, the First Responder Fee would be pulled out and treated as a separate public hearing.

Mr. Brew said annually staff came before Council to discuss proposed changes in fees and charges. Staff would be coming back before Council on March 6 for a public hearing on the proposed fees.

Mr. Brew discussed some of the changes in the Building Safety Code as listed on the new handout.

Councilor Pishioneri asked about mechanical permits listed that could only be purchased in groups of ten. He asked if they had formerly been available one at a time.

Ms. Pappas said the mechanical permits themselves were new. In the past, only electrical permits were issued. The fee was \$50 for ten.

Mr. Brew further discussed changes in the fees in the Building Safety Code and the proposed fees in the Fire and Life Safety (F&LS) fees.

Councilor Fitch asked if these were increases over last year or were the same assumptions as when first brought to Council.

Ms. Pappas said this reflected the immediate past conversations with Council.

Councilor Fitch asked if the proposed fees for F&LS filled the gap.

Chief Murphy explained and said the fees proposed would fill the gap of \$636,999, even without the First Responder Fees.

Councilor Ralston said he recalled a larger gap of \$1.1M.

Chief Murphy said the Blue Ribbon Committee started with a target of \$1.1M, \$636,000 of new revenues, \$100,000 of expenditure reductions and a gap of about \$250,000.

Mr. Brew discussed the Development Services Department (DSD) proposals. Previous Council direction was to move toward better cost recovery. He said staff had looked into increasing the expedited review fee from two and a half times the standard fee to three times the standard fee. He noted that Development Services Director Bill Grile and his staff worked hard on the fee schedule and provided options for 60%, 70%, 80% and 100% cost recovery. Fees remained the same for lower income customers and were raised in other areas.

Councilor Lundberg asked if three times for expedited review would still be acceptable.

Mr. Grile said there had been no substantial complaints regarding this raise. He referred to the chart and discussed certain applications that would experience no increase at all and others that would see an increase. He asked Council to note the following figures at the top of each column which reflected the cost of each program including DSD and Public Works (PW): \$1.2M at the top of the blue column; \$1.4M at the top of the pink column; \$1.6M at the top of the green column; and \$2.0M at the top of the purple column.

Councilor Fitch asked if the current cost recovery was at sixty percent.

Mr. Grile said it was substantially less than sixty percent because of the increase in additional personnel.

Mr. Brew said adding the Fire Marshal's office to this cost model brought the percentage recovered down further.

Councilor Lundberg asked if this was to make the costs recovered more comprehensive.

Ms. Pappas said that was correct. When this formula was started, it only included the planners. Now all departments had been added and that had brought down the percentage.

Councilor Pishioneri asked about the pre-submittal fee and why it decreased.

Mr. Grile said the City was trying to encourage the pre-submittal meetings for a more efficient process for everyone.

Councilor Fitch asked if the amounts listed at the top of the columns were additional revenue or that much above the current amount.

Mr. Grile said the current budget was about \$900,000 and the figures at the top of the column were additional revenue that would increase to those amounts (i.e. blue column \$1.2M - \$900,000 = \$300,000 additional revenue).

Councilor Fitch said Springfield welcomed development in the City, but didn't expect the average taxpayer to bear the burden of new development. She said her intent in the past was to have the fees high enough so other departments were not subsidizing. She said the sixty percent recovery was not a fair option. She was not ready to go to one hundred percent, but was ready to go forward with a fairly quick gradual increase and educating people about the increases. She said higher recovery needed to be gained so we would not lose out on human services in other areas.

Mr. Grile discussed sustainability. He discussed expedited reviews for large developments in the past that had brought in additional revenue. He said it was more land divisions that were coming in now due to less land available. Staff was looking at the land supply issue.

Councilor Lundberg asked how many of the proposed fees were tied to new development that would also have SDC charges to pay. SDC's were charged to absorb new development. She said it was a balancing act.

Mr. Grile said land divisions and site plan fees would apply to those that paid SDC's.

Councilor Fitch discussed charging fairly for those large developments that took a lot of staff time.

Councilor Ballew said as the developable land diminished, the City would not be able to make much money because core services would still need to be provided. She said she did not have a problem with one hundred percent recovery if the fees were the true recovery of the cost. If based on cost, the costs should be less for small projects than larger projects.

Mr. Grile said in some cases that was true, but in others there was a minimum threshold. He said the fees did not include the long-range planning projects.

Councilor Ballew said those that lived in the Historic District had to pay an extra fee for the Historic Commission review. She hoped those people would receive some type of offset so they did not pay a double fee.

Mr. Grile said those neighbors did currently have a review that other homeowners were not encumbered with.

Councilor Pishioneri asked if any of the fees were at one hundred percent cost recovery.

Mr. Grile discussed relationship pricing.

Ms. Pappas said none were at one hundred percent cost recovery.

Mr. Brew explained how he calculated the cost recovery model.

Mr. Grile discussed the difficulty in standardizing that response as some applications were submitted in great shape and took little time and others required a lot of follow-up and extra work.

Councilor Ballew asked if the City used Time Card coding.

Mr. Brew said they currently did in Public Works. He said the City was hoping to move to an electronic timecard which would make that more feasible.

Councilor Fitch asked what other communities of similar size were doing regarding cost recovery.

Mr. Grile said the smaller communities were subsidizing the most. Springfield's fees were more realistic than other jurisdictions, but were comparable with other fast growing communities.

Councilor Fitch said we wanted growth, but growth needed to pay their fair share.

Councilor Ralston said they had been trying to graduate the fees up to more cost recovery, but it seemed to be decreasing. He said eighty percent looked good to him, but thought it was reasonable to go to seventy percent and try to achieve eighty percent next year. He said the land was so constrained without an expansion of the urban growth boundary (UGB), less development

was going to occur, making it more expensive. He said the City had to be able to recover the cost of providing the service. Seventy percent would be an additional \$500,000.

Councilor Ballew asked if the charges looked equivalent relative to the appreciation of land value.

Mr. Brew said they were not, they were just calculating the cost of inflation for people and materials. He said those costs were increasing three to five percent a year.

Councilor Fitch said long term it would be wonderful once the City had a one hundred percent recovery, to include credits for redevelopment or sustainable developments as it got more difficult to develop.

Councilor Lundberg said that was a good idea because brownfields were generally more expensive.

Councilor Ballew said those ideas didn't make any money.

Discussion was held on the advantages and disadvantages of offering those types of credits for redevelopment and building on brownfields.

Mayor Leiken discussed a case that went to the Supreme Court in Michigan involving a developer challenging the Clean Water Act. He noted that often the local jurisdictions would approve a project, but the Federal Government stopped the project. The Federal Government's regulations make a huge impact. He suggested staff stay the course on inching up on cost recovery.

Councilor Ralston discussed credits for brownfields, and the possible disadvantage in offering those credits if the City pursued increasing the UGB.

Mayor Leiken said that was where master planning came into play. He gave an example.

Discussion was held regarding the Metro Plan and TransPlan and expanding the UGB.

Councilor Ballew asked about the total of development fees. She asked if there was a hole in the DSD budget that needed to be covered and if additional staff needed to be added for the upcoming year.

Mr. Grile said a re-organization was in progress to deal with financial issues within the department. Staff was continuing to work on efficiencies in the department as well. Through the use of technology and doing things a little differently, there could be opportunities to keep up without continually adding staff.

Ms. Pappas said there would be some opportunities or challenges in the proposed City Manager budget for each department for adequately funding replacement needs, such as servers, etc.

Councilor Ballew said whatever increases that came would free up General Fund money for other departments. If the chart did show actual cost recovery, she would support one hundred percent.

Councilor Fitch asked about advantages or disadvantages in setting the fees at eighty or one hundred percent, and the difference that would leave between the expedited process and the normal process. She asked if extra personnel could be hired to clear up areas that had slowed down.

Mr. Grile said Public Works and Development Services Department were having difficulty filling the highly skilled positions in their departments. Once those positions were filled the delays could be lessened.

Councilor Lundberg agreed. She said she would prefer increasing the fees incrementally rather than all at once. Once the additional staff was hired and efficiencies were put into place, the issue could come back to Council next year for further consideration. She said Springfield had always been business friendly and she wanted to balance that. She would like to start at the seventy percent level.

Councilor Pishioneri said he agreed with the seventy percent level at this time and said he was against rising above seventy percent at this point. He said it was prudent to show some increases incrementally. He asked why the figures for vacations of public easements didn't go past seventy percent on the chart. He also asked about the annexation fee and the large increase in that fee.

Mr. Grile said staff would look into the vacation figures and make the correction.

Ms. Pappas explained the annexation fee and noted that it was one that was underlined, meaning it increased more than fourteen percent.

Councilor Ballew suggested increasing to seventy-five percent recovery.

Councilors agreed to go with seventy-five percent.

Councilor Fitch said she didn't want to see the First Responder fee included with the other fees, even as a separate item during the March 6 public hearing. She said it clouded over everything else. She asked to have it brought back at a later date.

Councilor Ralston said citizens had to decide and he wanted to hear input from citizens for the First Responder Fee.

Councilor Fitch said she was very concerned with that fee. She would rather not see it at this time.

Mayor Leiken said this could be discussed with council leadership during Agenda Review on Friday.

1. I-5/Franklin Boulevard Interchange.

Transportation Manager Nick Arnis presented the staff report on this item. ODOT finds no congestion or safety issues with the I-5/Franklin interchange, or compelling public support, and wants to focus on other priorities; however, ODOT will co-manage further study if the metro jurisdictions want to proceed with a refinement plan using the \$400,000 federal transportation earmark.



City and ODOT staff met with Council last November with an update about the I-5/Franklin interchange process. The Council reviewed interchange design concepts, costs, and an outline of the public involvement process. The public involvement strategy was for ODOT to hold three open houses to engage the public about possible interchange concepts and ask whether the I-5/Franklin interchange study should continue. Information from the public meetings would be reviewed by the Cities of Springfield and Eugene and Lane County, and ODOT would request a "thumbs up or a thumbs down" decision from the jurisdictions about further studies. ODOT received about 178 responses from the three open houses. Of the total, 54 people said to continue the study, 20 people said continue the study but with various contingencies, 25 people said no unless other issues are dealt with, 35 people said no under any circumstances, and 39 people responded but did not answer the question about going forward with the study. At the City open house, of the 35 people that responded to the further study question, 26 said yes. Based on the open house results and 2004 traffic data (which ODOT says indicates no congestion or safety issues at I-5/Franklin), and a desire to work on other large projects "driven by documented technical need," ODOT will no longer lead the study effort for the I-5/Franklin interchange. ODOT is willing to manage an ongoing study, but only if metro jurisdictions provide the 10.27% match for a \$400,000 federal earmark. The Eugene Council has approved up to \$20,000 toward the match. ODOT staff will attend the work session. Council may wish to inquire about the rationale underlying ODOT's conclusions in light of the April 13, 2005 ODOT letter to the City committing to provide \$2.75 million to fund an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and fund \$500,000 for the study which further commits ODOT staff "...to provide the technical information, the needed transportation system improvements, preliminary cost estimates and documentation necessary for the metropolitan area to complete the required system planning." Council may also wish to seek clarification about that commitment given that the traffic study upon which ODOT relies occurred a year earlier, in 2004. Finally, ODOT takes the position that any added ramps to the I-5/Franklin interchange that are studied in a refinement plan should not create "...additional degradation to the state transportation system". Council may wish to explore with ODOT what would constitute degradation in this context and explore how ODOT views its mission with respect to community and economic development.

Mayor Leiken acknowledged State Representative Terry Beyer who was present in the audience.

Mr. Arnis introduced Jane Lee, ODOT Area Five Manager, Tom Boyatt, ODOT Senior Planner, and Sam Seskinen from CH2M Hill and Project Manager for the I-5/Franklin Interchange Study.

Mr. Arnis said tonight's meeting was to review and comment on the outcome of the open houses, Eugene's recent action and ODOT's position on the project.

Mr. Arnis discussed the input from the open houses which was favorable in Springfield, but more mixed in Eugene. Since the open houses, ODOT put out a position about how they felt at this point regarding the study. He explained further. ODOT said they would manage certain parts of the project. During the Eugene Council meeting, staff was given direction to go forward with the study with certain conditions including bridge location. The Eugene Council also gave staff direction that Eugene would put up some match money for the \$400,000 earmark that was attached to the study. Lane County Board of Commissioners met last week regarding this issue, but did not choose to put up any match for the project. The Commissioners were interested in moving ahead with the study.

Mr. Boyatt said the Lane County staff suggested they wait until Springfield had met and made a decision.

Mr. Arnis said if the study was going to go forward into a refinement plan, staff would need to know the roles and responsibilities for managing the project by Springfield, Eugene, Lane County or ODOT. All three jurisdictions had different expectations, cultures and approaches regarding how to spend the \$400,000 on the refinement plan. It would need to be determined who would lead the study. He referred to ODOT's letter regarding further degradation of I-5, Highway 126, and Franklin Boulevard. He referred to earlier letters from ODOT for funding the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). He asked if Council wanted staff to continue to work on this project and proceeding with a study at I-5/Franklin.

Mr. Boyatt said when ODOT met with Council in November of 2005, they had their issue summary which they shared with Council. Between November of 2005 and January of 2006, ODOT did their due diligence and took a closer look at the technical output and tried to get their understanding about what that output meant. They also looked somewhat at the public input. He said ODOT tried to get to a place where they could draft a problem statement. ODOT could not see a transportation problem. It was apparent that there was a desire on the part of both communities to take advantage at that point of the bridge construction and putting ramps on the new bridges. He said that option was not feasible. When ODOT realized the bridge was moving ahead with Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA) dollars, there would be tight time frames and ramps wouldn't fit onto a bridge, the department made a commitment to design a permanent bridge with every effort not to preclude ramp connections on the south side of the river. ODOT had internal discussions and went back to the project management team in early January explaining the direction of ODOT's position and recognizing the Federal earmark had been successfully placed in the bill and was available. The state would respect the communities desire to move ahead if that was their decision.

Mr. Seskinen described the project process. He said ODOT had worked with staff from the two cities, the County, Lane Transit District (LTD), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and others for about a year on this project. He discussed the analysis his firm had considered. He said City staff was well represented during those meetings. He said the only problem identified was the economic development opportunity, but not a state transportation problem. He said there was evidence that there were hopes for Glenwood's continued development, but the traffic in that area was local in nature and would start using I-5 as a preferred path for other trips, further challenging the state system. He noted the problems from the state perspective and opportunities from the local perspective. He said ODOT had looked at the facts and heard the input and needed to know where to go from here.

Councilor Ralston asked if ODOT would be more inclined to assist if there was a transportation problem in their viewpoint. He said he used the Glenwood exit every day and he discussed the problem with going north from Eugene or coming into Eugene from the north. He said clearly there was a problem. He referred to Moon Mountain and a housing development that was coming in to that area. He discussed the transportation issues in that area and noted that future development would only make it worse. He said he had heard that people didn't want bridges over the river for offramps. He discussed a possibility of relocating the dump and putting an interchange in that area which would keep it away from the river. The Glenwood exit could be taken out of the main collector, and put the main intersection in that location. He said there should be a way to make it happen. He said it was still an important project.

Councilor Ballew agreed that the current design going into that area was badly formed. She asked if ODOT looked at freight mobility.

Mr. Boyatt said they did not look into freight mobility.

Councilor Ballew said improving the interchange would be an advantage to freight mobility. She asked what kind of public support ODOT would need to move forward.

Mr. Boyatt said on large, expensive, complex projects, they needed about ninety percent from the community in order to sustain the project through the obstacles.

Mayor Leiken said there was never ninety percent support for the West Eugene Parkway (WEP), yet ODOT moved forward on that study.

Mr. Boyatt said he could not address the WEP since he was not involved in that, but did note that they had nearly ninety percent for the I-5/Beltline interchange.

Councilor Lundberg said this had been on a fast track because of the potential opportunity to connect to the bridges and to plan for future development. It's important for people to conveniently get off the freeway and get into town to such places as Glenwood, the Regional Sports Center, the Federal Courthouse, the University of Oregon (UofO) and downtown Eugene without getting lost. There would be degradation on Franklin and Highway 126 because there would be more traffic. She said she understood that the bridge could be designed to add offramps later somehow following an EIS process. She said the Glenwood Urban Renewal was on a twenty year track and there would be some degradation of Franklin Boulevard. She said the concern was whether or not people could get off the freeway going to Springfield or Eugene. She discussed the WEP project that had little support, but continued to be on the project list. She said she wanted to move forward with the earmark of \$400,000. She said it was more a question of timing and asked how quickly it needed to move forward. She said there needed to be ways to get on and off the freeway and options needed to be considered that did not include supports that included bridges.

Councilor Pishioneri said he supported a connection at Franklin Boulevard. He said the argument about degradation didn't have any merit. He said there would be a trade-off on where the vehicles would drive and degradation would only occur by the addition of extra vehicles to the area. He said there did need to be collaboration between jurisdictions, but Springfield had needs in Glenwood. He said he didn't understand the problem. He supported going forward.

Councilor Fitch said when ODOT came to Springfield as a partner to move forward on a fast track for the replacement bridge, Springfield was behind ODOT even though there were concerns and problems. Springfield stepped forward and made sure it happened. She said the time to plan for offramps when building a seventy-five year bridge was now. She said nearly seventy-five percent of the Springfield audience who provided input was supportive. She said the offramp did need to include the UofO. The current state system did not offer a direct connection to either downtown and this interchange could alleviate that problem. She said without access to either downtown, greater burdens were being put on other systems. She said she was supportive of going forward, even if it only included an offramp into Glenwood. She said she felt the same urgency that ODOT felt when asking for the expedited process for the temporary bridges. She

said the time was now and it was fair to say ODOT should step up with the partnership to make it happen. She said in looking out seventy-five years and the development that would occur, it was poor foresight not to plan for that now. She said to go forward with this interchange could be a win-win for everyone. If ODOT needed to get ninety percent support from Springfield, they could get that. She said the voters wanted the Glenwood Urban Renewal District, but there needed to be a way to get people there. She didn't want to wait. She said they may be two separate plans, but they were companion plans.

Councilor Lundberg said she had no problem moving forward, but wanted to be careful in how the management system was set up between jurisdictions, particularly if we were only looking at an offramp into Glenwood. She said Springfield had competent staff to move us forward with this process and she would be comfortable with us taking the leading role. She discussed the \$400,000 earmark and said it was a great concern how that got spent.

Councilor Ballew said she would like to have Lane County partner with Springfield and Eugene by funding \$20,000 for their match. If not, she asked if the City had enough to go it alone. She asked staff if Springfield could be in more of a lead position because ODOT did not want to take that role.

Mr. Arnis said the City did have the resources in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Franklin Boulevard planning. He said because Springfield would be co-managing the project with the City of Eugene and hopefully with Lane County, he could not say what the roles and expectations would be for this project. Those roles needed to be sorted out.

Councilor Fitch referred to stipulations put on by City of Eugene regarding their side of any proposed offramps. She said those stipulations didn't necessarily need to apply to the work done for Springfield on our side.

Ms. Pappas said staff could speak with the other two partners, and start to develop an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with ODOT, Lane County and the City of Eugene. The IGA may have certain stipulations.

Councilor Fitch said Council wanted to see the outcome of the \$400,000.

Mayor Leiken asked what ODOT used for their projection of capacity for safety problems at Glenwood or Judkins Point interchange out to 2020. He asked if ODOT updated their reports on an annual basis.

Mr. Boyatt said the State of the Interstate was a current condition/no-build report on I-5 from California to Washington and was developed in 1999/2000. He said that report had not been updated yet.

Mayor Leiken said a lot of changes had occurred in Springfield since that time. He said he didn't believe that projection to 2020 was still accurate. He discussed the demolition required of both the old bridges and the temporary bridges when the new bridges were constructed. He asked where the demolition permit for that action would come from.

Ms. Pappas said that was a good question. She suggested perhaps the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), the Oregon Fish and Wildlife (OFW) Department, and the Corps of Engineers would have input.

Mayor Leiken asked if a new greenway permit would be required for the new bridges that went over the waterways.

Ms. Lee said that would occur with the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) for the new bridges.

Mayor Leiken asked if Springfield staff would have the time to work with ODOT on the greenway permit by 2012.

Ms. Pappas said staff would do as directed by Council.

Mayor Leiken said Springfield had a lot of projects ahead. He suggested Springfield participate with the \$20,000 match and move forward on the \$400,000 study. Senator Smith went to bat for Springfield on this funding and it made sense to move forward. He said all opportunities should be looked at for this project. He said the jurisdictions should try to come up with a vision and an opportunity. He asked if the Oregon Transportation Commissioner (OTC) and ODOT were on the same page. He said he spoke with one of the Commissioners of OTC and heard they were looking to move forward and try to get a retrofit for interchanges when the new bridges were built. He said he would continue to speak with the OTC Commissioners.

Councilor Lundberg recalled the cost for the EIS for the I-5/Beltline interchange was about \$2M and asked if this \$400,000 would pay for the entire study.

Mr. Arnis said the \$400,000 was for the refinement plan process. He said it would take the ideas that had been drafted and would explore them further with the public. Following that process, a preferred alternative would be chosen which would move into the NEPA process for an EIS. The full process was estimated at about \$2.75M for the study. The bridge EIS would have useful information that could be useful for the interchanges. He said they could try to make it work within the funding amount given.

Mr. Seskinen said ODOT had originally said they would undertake the planning process and then each Council and the County Commission would vote on whether or not to move forward with an amendment to the Region's Transportation Plan with this project included. On the basis of that commitment the agency would move into an environmental document. In the interim, Senator Smith was able to provide additional funds, but the commitment to amend the TransPlan was not yet considered. He said this was not at the point of having a regional conversation among the cities and the County about the importance of this as a community development project for the Metropolitan area. Before getting to an environmental document, that hurdle needed to be cleared. ODOT discovered a lot of important information such as cost, environmental issues and political issues. There was no easy solution to the funding and there were traffic issues. ODOT would now work with technical staff to get as much value as possible from the \$400,000.

Mayor Leiken said it sounded like ODOT was backing out of this project as a partner. He said the issue was whether or not ODOT would be our partner on this project. He said it seemed ODOT's commitment was to build a bridge and make sure goods from Washington were transported to California. He said it was frustrating for ODOT to publicly comment that they

wanted to continue to be a partner with the community on establishing a plan. Without a study, it would not be known whether or not this interchange was feasible. He said this was still listed as a top five project at area meetings. Springfield felt that ODOT was not being a partner. Springfield wanted to continue, but wanted ODOT to be working with Springfield on this project instead of a stand-by partner. It didn't seem that ODOT cared if this interchange was built or not. He said the Council could have helped bring large groups to the meetings showing support if they had known that was what ODOT needed. Springfield wanted a commitment with ODOT and he had hoped that Jeff Sheik from the state office could have attended tonight's meeting. He said there was no need for ODOT to comment at this time. He said he appreciated Mr. Boyatt working with Springfield in the past.

Councilor Lundberg said she wanted to confirm that Metro Plan and TransPlan needed to be changed for this project to proceed. That was correct. She said this could be categorized as modernization as the problem as outlined in TransPlan. She questioned the order things needed to occur for this project to move forward.

Mr. Arnis said the Regional Transportation Plan and TransPlan would both need to be amended. The project needed to be included in the Regional Transportation Plan before it could go through the NEPA process, which included the environmental assessment (EA) and EIS. He said the steps needed to be sorted out. He said that was one of the complexities of managing the technical and policy side of what needed to happen with the \$400,000 with the other jurisdictions. Because it was a federal highway and interstate, ODOT had to participate in that discussion as well.

Councilor Ballew asked if they had identified cost estimates for the project.

Mr. Boyatt said the estimate costs for the interchange at Franklin ranged from \$80M and \$120M, and an overhaul of the Glenwood interchange ranged from about \$30M - \$50M.

Councilor Ballew asked if that included new signage. Yes.

Councilor Fitch asked about the cost of new bridges.

Mr. Boyatt said options were still being considered regarding size and other factors.

Mayor Leiken said he would like to have the information about the demolition permits for the old and temporary bridges.

Ms. Pappas said staff would find out that information and bring it back to Council.

Mayor Leiken thanked ODOT staff for attending tonight's meeting.

Councilor Fitch said they appreciated the work being done on Beltline and I-5.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:25 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

---

Sidney W. Leiken  
Mayor

Attest:

---

Amy Sowa  
City Recorder